



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

. . . President Nicholas Murray Butler, writing to the American Peace Society on the relations between the international peace movement and the two American countries immediately concerned in the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Ghent, says: "In my judgment the undefended boundary between the United States and Canada is the model and ideal toward which the opponents of militarism, huge armaments and war should direct their efforts. On either side of this long imaginary line, two great busy, ambitious and independent peoples have managed to live and work together for more than one hundred years. Has this fact not given to Canada and to the United States the right to lead in the movement for international peace?"

Commissions on Limitation of Armaments.

The following letter has been sent by the International Peace Bureau at Berne, signed by the president and general secretary, to all the governments of the world:

TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS:

Sir: Your attention has, without doubt, been called to the fact that on June 25, 1910, the Congress of the United States of North America authorized the creation of a Commission charged with the examination of the most appropriate means for bringing about a limitation of armaments, which, according to the expression of the Czar in his manifesto of 1898, "weigh heavily upon all the nations and by their exactions reach and paralyze the public welfare at its very source."

It appears from a communication made by Mr. Taft, President of the United States, on the 6th of December, 1910, that the appointment of the members of this Commission has been delayed because of the inaction of other governments which have been invited by him to inform him of their intention likewise to create Commissions with the same end in view.

In the name of the large number of societies connected with the International Peace Bureau, we urge that a favorable response be given by your government to the communication sent out by the American government. The formation of a Commission, whose purpose will only be that of investigation, does not constitute in any manner a pledge as to steps which may afterwards be taken. It will only give evidence that the desire, often expressed by the governments, to lessen the crushing burdens which actually rest upon the people, is a reality and not a meaningless phrase.

There is no doubt that at the present time the nations are suffering from the situation brought about by armed peace, and that the maintenance of this armed peace in the present conditions places an obstacle in the way of the reforms which are imperatively necessary to assure the moral and material progress of humanity.

We are convinced that this appeal, which we are making to you, will not be in vain, and that you will be glad to transmit it to your government and to solicit therefrom a favorable response to the initiative taken by the government of the United States of North America.

Thanking you in advance for the kind consideration which you may give to this communication, we beg of

you, Mr. Minister, to accept the assurance of our high consideration.

For the Permanent International Peace Bureau,
H. La Fontaine, *President*. A. Gobat, *General Secretary*.

Sir Edward Grey's Response to President Taft's Advance.

In his great speech on Armaments in the House of Commons on March 13, Sir Edward Grey spoke as follows, amid continual cheers, in response to the suggestions of President Taft in regard to an unlimited treaty of arbitration between the two countries:

"I can see but one thing which will affect this naval and military expenditure on the wholesale scale in which it must be affected if there is to be real relief and assurance. You will not get it till nations do what individuals have done, and that is come to regard an appeal to law as the natural course for nations instead of an appeal to force.

"Public opinion has been driving in this direction. Twice within the last twelve months the President of the United States has sketched out a step in advance in arbitration more momentous than anything that any practical statesman in his position has ventured to say before, and pregnant with far-reaching consequences. I should like to quote the two statements of the President of the United States. Here is one: 'Personally I do not see any more reason why matters of national honor should not be referred to a court of arbitration than matters of property or national proprietorship. I know that is going farther than most men are willing to go, but I do not see why questions of honor may not be submitted to a tribunal composed of men of honor who understand questions of national honor, to abide by their decision, as well as any other question of difference arising between nations.'

"The other statement is this: 'If we can negotiate and put through a positive agreement with some other nation to abide by the adjudication of an international arbitral court in every issue which cannot be settled by negotiations, no matter what it involves, whether honor, territory, or money, we shall have made a long step forward by demonstrating that it is possible for two nations at least to establish between them the same system of due process of law as exists between individuals under a government.' Those are bold and courageous words.

"We have no proposal before us, and unless public opinion will rise to the level of discussing a proposal of that kind, not with reference to charges of inconsistency, not with reference to whether one nation or another is going to gain particularly by some agreement — unless it can rise to the height of discussing it as a great movement in the opinion of the world, it cannot be carried out. But supposing it took place, supposing two of the greatest nations of the world were to make it clear to the whole world by an agreement of such a character as that, that under no circumstances were they going to war again, I venture to say that the effect upon the world at large of the example would be one which would be bound to have beneficent consequences. It is true that two nations who did that might still be exposed to

attack from a third nation which had not entered into the agreement. I think it would probably lead to their following it up by an agreement that they would join with each other in any case in which one of them had a quarrel with a third power and on which arbitration was refused. More and more the tendency is growing in the world to recognize that war between two great countries must be a serious thing, not only for them but for the neutral powers; and more and more the tendency would be for nations who had come to the conclusion that as between themselves they were not going to fight to find it to their interests to join together to keep the peace of the world. I have spoken of that because I do not think a statement of that kind put forward by a man in the position of the President of the United States ought to go without response. In entering into an agreement of that kind, remember there would be great risks. If you agree to refer everything to arbitration, as the President of the United States has said, you must be prepared to take certain risks. You must be prepared for some sacrifice of national pride. An agreement of that kind, so sweeping as that, were it proposed to us, we should be delighted to have such a proposal; but I should feel it was something so momentous, so far-reaching in its possible consequences, that it would require not only the signature of both governments, but the deliberate and decided sanction of Parliament. That I believe would be obtained.

"I know that to bring about changes of this kind public opinion has to rise to a high plane of idealism, higher than it can rise to in ordinary times, higher than some members opposite, I imagine, think it ever can rise to. Well, in ordinary times I dare say that may be true. But the times are not ordinary with this expenditure, and they will become still less ordinary as the expenditure increases. The minds of men are working upon this question, and if you will look back into history, you will find that there do come times at favorable moments when public opinion has risen to heights which a generation previously would have been thought impossible. It was so when public opinion abolished slavery, with all its vested interests, and especially difficult in the United States itself. I can imagine there may have been — there must have been — occasions before the United States put an end to slavery when any person might have demonstrated that the public opinion of the United States could never rise to that height. But it did. It did it without counting the cost in treasure, in blood, and in risk to their national existence. So I think it is not impossible, though I admit in the case of such an enormous change the progress may be slow — it is not impossible that public opinion in the world at large may insist, if it is fortunate enough to find leaders who have the courage, the sort of courage which has been shown in the utterances I have quoted to the House — may insist upon finding relief in this direction. Some armies and navies would remain, no doubt, but they would remain then not in rivalry with each other, but as the police of the world. Some honorable members may say we should not live to see the day. I dare say we shall not. I think we shall live to see some progress made. The attitude of the noble lord (Lord Winterton) is one of repudiation of the statement I have quoted to the House. Mine is one of encouragement. And even if

our hopes may not be realized in our time, there is no reason why we should not press forward in the direction in which we see a possible means of relief. What is impossible in one generation may become possible in another. It is rendered more possible in another for the fact that one generation presses in that direction, even if it fails to attain the goal.

"The great nations of the world are in bondage at the present moment to their armies and navies, increasing bondage. It does not seem to me impossible that in some future year they may discover, as individuals have discovered, that law is a better remedy than force, and that all the time they have been in bondage to this tremendous expenditure the prison door has been locked on the inside. If you think that visionary, and not in the region of practical politics, my reply is that at any rate we ought not to leave what the President of the United States has said without response. I admit it is a response not to proposals, because we have no proposals before us, but to the idea. It is at any rate the best which we can do."

The Importance of Judicial Settlement.

BY ELIHU ROOT, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NEW YORK, AND PRESIDENT OF THE CARNEGIE PEACE FOUNDATION.

Address delivered at Washington, in December last, at the Conference of the Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, and published in pamphlet form by the Society.

We all of us agree, and a very large part of the world agrees, that there ought to be an end to war; that it is brutal, wasteful and stupid. We have been talking about it for a great many years. The volume of sound has swelled and grown into a great chorus of universal acclaim for the principles of peace with justice.

But all great movements have a definite development. They pass from stage to stage. The declaration of principles in the beginning is but the first step, and the method of development is from the general to the particular, from the theoretical to the practical, from the proposal to the accomplishment.

Now the movement for peace, for the settlement of the disputes of mankind by peaceful means, is, it seems to me, passing from one stage to another in these wonderful years in which we live. Having accumulated enough momentum, by means of the missionary work that has been done, by means of the propaganda which has been prosecuted, we are beginning now to pass into the stage of careful, thoughtful, definite, certain inquiry into the specific causes of war and the specific remedies to be applied. So only can progress be made towards a practical conclusion.

The organization of the Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes is one of the great steps forward in this second stage of development of the worldwide peace movement.

The causes of war may be roughly and of course superficially and generally distributed into three categories. First, there are the real differences between nations as to their respective rights. One nation claims territory and another claims the same territory. One nation claims the right to trade in a particular way, at a particular place, and another nation claims an exclusive right.